

REMARKS

Applicant concurrently files herewith an Excess Claim Fee Payment letter and corresponding excess claim fee, for two (2) excess claims.

Claims 1-38 are all of the claims presently pending in the application. Applicant has added claims 37 and 38 to provide more varied protection for the claimed invention.

Applicant (s) has amended claims 35 and 36 to more particularly define the claimed invention.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14-16, 35, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gunn et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0210402; hereinafter “Gunn”) in view of Comerford et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,963,671; hereinafter “Comerford”). Claims 3, 4, 13, 17, 21-26, and 30-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gunn and Comerford in view of Do (U.S. Patent No. 6,417,869; hereinafter “Do”). Claims 5 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gunn and Comerford in view of Cirne (U.S. Patent No. 5,625,763; hereinafter “Cirne”). Claims 9, 10, 18-20, and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gunn, Comerford, and Do in view of Cirne.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections in the following discussion.

I. THE CLAIMED INVENTION

An exemplary embodiment of the claimed invention, as defined by, for example, independent claim 1, is directed to a display control device that includes a display control section adapted to display a plurality of button groups each having at least one button in a monitor connected thereto and to display any of the buttons displayed in the monitor in focused state, and a button change section including an in-group button changing operation

unit adapted to change the button to be focused from one button to another within the button group, and an inter-group button changing operation unit adapted to change the button to be focused from a button of one button group to a button of another button group. When the button to be focused is changed by the inter-group button changing operation unit from the button of one button group to the button of another button group, the display control section displays a predetermined button of the button group changed in focused state.

The present invention provides a display control device, which, when a button to be focused is changed by an inter-group button changing operation unit from a button of one button group to a button of another button group, the display control section displays a predetermined button of the button group changed in focused state. In this manner, the operation of the display may be comprehended easily and quickly.

II. THE PRIOR ART REFERENCES

A. The Gunn Reference

The Examiner alleges that Gunn would have been combined with Comerford to teach the claimed invention of claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14-16, 35, and 36. Applicant submits, however, that, even if combined, the alleged combination of references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

That is, the alleged combination of Gunn and Comerford does not teach or suggest, "*a button change section including an in-group button changing operation unit adapted to change the button to be focused from one button to another within the button group, and an inter-group button changing operation unit adapted to change the button to be focused from a button of one button group to a button of another button group*"¹, as recited in exemplary claim

1.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner alleges, “Gunn teaches dynamically changing character configurations that are presented to the user upon the likelihood of a selection where location is modified to highlight particular characters (see paragraph 125).” The Examiner’s statement, however, is inconsistent with the teachings of Gunn.

That is, Gunn merely provides a single keyboard configuration where the most commonly used keys are located substantially in the center of the circular keyboard (see Gunn at paragraph [0125]). Gunn also teaches, with reference to Figures 10-12, that the user may swap between several keyboard layouts (see Gunn at paragraph [0128]). Specifically, Gunn teaches switching from an alphabetical keyboard (Figure 10) to either a numerical keyboard (Figure 11) or a symbol keyboard (Figure 12).

Gunn, however, does not teach or suggest changing a button to be focused within a button group or within another button group. Indeed, the configuration of the buttons within each keyboard configuration is static. Gunn merely teaches that it may be possible to switch to a different keyboard type. The button that was focused on in the first keyboard, however, is not present in the other keyboards (e.g., see Gunn at Figures 10-12).

The Examiner further alleges, “Comerford teaches modifying the location of characters based upon their likelihood of selection.” (See Office Action dated March 13, 2008). The Examiner’s statement, however, is inconsistent with the teachings of Comerfield.

That is, the location of the characters in the keyboard of Comerford is static. Comerford merely teaches highlighting one or more buttons, during typing, that are likely to be the next selected button. Comerford, like Gunn, does not teach or suggest an inter-group button changing operation unit adapted to change the button to be focused from a button of

one button group to a button of another button group. Indeed, Comerford does not teach or suggest a plurality of groups of buttons. Comerford merely teaches highlighting individual buttons within a standard keyboard.

Therefore, Applicant submits that, even if combined, the alleged combination of references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

B. The Do Reference

The Examiner alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined Gunn with Comerford and Do to teach the claimed invention of claims 3, 4, 13, 17, 21-26, and 30-34. Applicant submits, however, that, even if combined, the alleged combination of references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

That is, claims 3, 4, and 13 are allowable at least based on similar reasons to those set forth above, in section A, with respect to claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14-16, 35, and 36.

Moreover, Applicants submit that the alleged combination of references does not teach or suggest, “*a display control section adapted to display in a monitor connected thereto ten keys composed of a plurality of buttons for inputting a telephone number and a communication button for starting a telephone communication, and to display any of the ten keys and the communication button displayed in the monitor in focused state*”, as recited in exemplary claim 17, and similarly recited in exemplary claim 26.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner alleged that Gunn “teaches display control device comprising: a display control section adapted to display in a monitor connected thereto ten keys composed of a plurality of buttons for inputting a telephone number and a

communication button for starting a telephone communication.” (See Office Action dated March 13, 2008 at page 10). The Examiner’s statement, however, is inconsistent with the teachings of Gunn.

Indeed, Gunn merely teaches a numeric keyboard for data entry (see Gunn at Figure 12). Gunn does not, however, teach or suggest that the numeric keyboard is used for inputting a telephone number.

Furthermore, the numeric keyboard of Gunn does not include a communication button for starting a telephone communication. If the Examiner wishes to maintain this rejection, then we would request the Examiner to point out specifically, by reference number, where Gunn discloses a communication button for starting a telephone communication.

Therefore, Applicant submits that, even if combined, the alleged combination of references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

C. The Cirne Reference

The Examiner alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined Gunn and Comerford with Cirne to teach the claimed invention of claims 5 and 8. Moreover, the Examiner alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined Gunn, Comerford, and Do with Cirne to teach the claimed invention of claims 9, 10, 18-20, and 27-29. Applicant submits, however, that, even if combined, the alleged combination of references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

That is, claims 5, 8-10, 18-20, and 27-29 are allowable at least based on similar reasons to those set forth above, in section A, with respect to claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14-16,

35, and 36.

Therefore, Applicant submits that, even if combined, the alleged combination of references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

IV. NEW CLAIMS

Applicant has added new claims 37 and 38 to claim an additional feature of the invention and to provide more varied protection for the claimed invention. These claims are independently patentable because of the novel and nonobvious features recited therein.

Applicant submits that new claims 37 and 38 are patentable over the cited prior art references at least for analogous reasons to those set forth above with respect to claims 1-36.

V. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submit that claims 1-38, all of the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, Applicant requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

Serial No. 10/606,333 22
Docket No. C14-159454M/TRK
(NGB.261)

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: June 17, 2008


~~Scott M. Tulino, Esq.~~
Registration No. 48,317

Sean M. McGinn, Esq.
Registration No. 34,386

**MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
LAW GROUP, PLLC**
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, VA 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254